REMARKS

Claims 48 through 57 are in the case. Claims 1 through 47 have been cancelled. Claims 48 through 57 are added by this amendment.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Specifically, the Examiner stated that balloon (claims 17-40) must be shown or the feature canceled from the claims.

Applicant has amended this application to add an additional figure 5 showing the balloon (claims 17-40) and has amended the specification in two places to reference this additional figure. Care has been taken to assure that no new matter was entered.

Support for this additional figure can be found in the specification as originally filed on page 2, [0007], "In an alternative advantageous embodiment the distal catheter portion is provided with an expandable balloon."; page 4, [0013], "In an alternative configuration (not shown), the catheter 10 can also be a balloon catheter which at its distal end carries an expandable balloon which for example is suitably adapted for enlarging vessels or for inserting stents into constricted blood vessels."; and claims 17-40. Further support can be found in the priority application, DE 101 07 586.3 at page 3, the first full paragraph and page 5, the first full paragraph.

Claims 1 and 47 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrase "blood vessels, in particular blood vessels" is improper and should be changed to "blood vessels." Claims 1 and 47 have been canceled.

Claims 1, 6, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, 38, 42 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) or 102(e) as being anticipated by Stelzer et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,309,345. Claims 1, 18, 22, 26, 30, 34, 38 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) or 102(e) as being anticipated by Amundson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,178,346. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 42-44 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or §102(a) as being anticipated by Kranz, EP 1 072 281.

Claims 2-5, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35-37, 39-41 and 43-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stelzer in view of Roth, U.S. Patent No. 6,079,4124. Claims 4, 5, 45 and 46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kranz in view of Roth. Claims 18-20, 22-24, 26-28, 30-32, 34-36, 38-40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kranz in view of Stelzer.

With respect to Stelzer, Applicants wish to point out that the embodiment of figures 9 and 10 show a cautery device. A cautery tool is used to cut tissue by means of an alternating electrical current. The electrodes of a cautery tool cannot be compared to and not even used for a stimulation or a sensing electrode as claimed by Applicants. The electrode of the present invention, see 30 in figure 1, is a ring electrode used for stimulation or sensing purposes ("the electrode at least one of: delivering an electrical signal to body tissue adjoining the distal catheter portion and receiving an electrical signal from body tissue adjoining the distal catheter portion"), and is not used for cautery.

Further, the balloons shown in Stelzer figure 14 are a pair of occluding balloons that serve to seal the artery around the device, see column 11, line 47 and column 12, lines 9-11. The balloons of Stelzer are not angioplasty balloons, as claimed by Applicants.

Amundson does not disclose a blood endoscope as claimed by Applicants. Amundson simply is directed to an infrared endoscopic imaging device that can be used as a visual guide together with a *second separate* instrument, the second instrument being for example a cardiac catheter. Applicants specifically claim a blood endoscope where the cardiac catheter is integral with an external surface of the catheter sheath.

In addition, the balloon mentioned in the paragraph at column 2, lines 13-43 of Amundson is not an angioplasty balloon. It is a pair of balloons to occlude a vessel in order to fill the interspace between the balloons with a transparent liquid replacing the blood in the vessel.

Kranz does not disclose or suggest either an angioplasty balloon integral with an endoscopic catheter or a ring electrode integral with an endoscopic catheter.

None of the cited references disclose or suggest either singly or in combination an endoscopic catheter having a ring electrode integral with an outer surface of the catheter sheath where the ring electrode delivers an electrical signal to body tissue and/or receives an electrical signal from the body tissue or having an angioplasty balloon integral with the outer surface of the catheter sheath.

Claims 48 through 57 are not anticipated by Stelzer, Amundson or Kranz.

With respect to rejections under §103, Roth does not disclose or suggest the integral ring electrode or the integral angioplasty balloon as claimed by Applicants.

Claims 48 through 57 are not obvious in view of Stelzer, Amundson or Kranz in combination with Roth.

Applicants respectfully request prompt allowance of the claims.

Date August 10, 2005

Michael H. Minns
Reg. No. 31,985

Hahn Loeser + Parks LLP
One GOJO Plaza, Suite 300
Akron, Ohio 44311-1076
(330) 864-5550

Amendments to the Drawings:

Enclosed is corrected sheet of drawing for figure 1. The duplicate reference numeral "30" and associated lead line at the far right side of the figure have been removed.

Enclosed is one sheet of drawing adding a new figure 5 illustrating an expandable balloon at the distal catheter portion. Support for this figure can be found in the application as filed at page 2, [0007]; page 4, [0013]; and claims 17-40.

Attachments: Replacement Sheets - Two